

Claim 1 recites a door comprising a second seal including a second sealing surface interposed between a second attachment end and a second distal end, such that the first door panel in the doorway blocking position causes the first sealing surface to face the second sealing surface and positions the second distal end between the first distal end and at least one of the first door panel and the first attachment end. Clark does not teach the claimed subject matter, and the Office Action points to no structure in Clark as teaching the claimed subject matter.

Though the Office Action identifies some claim recitations as purportedly being taught by Clark, the Office Action fails to identify structure in Clark that corresponds to each and every limitation found in the claim, as is required in making an anticipation rejection. For example, the Office Action identified nothing that showed “the second distal end between the first distal end and at least one of the first door panel and the first attachment end,” as recited in the claims. It is well settled that a claim is “anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found...in a single prior art reference.” See, MPEP §2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Col. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because the Office Action points to no structure in Clark as teaching this claimed subject matter, or other recitations from these claims, the rejection is improper as must be withdrawn. Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 15 also stands rejected as anticipated by Clark. Claim 15 recites a door having a first seal “having a first sealing surface that faces the first door panel” and a second seal in “sliding relationship with the first seal and having a second sealing surface facing the first sealing surface when the first door panel is in the doorway blocking position.” Clark does not teach the claimed subject matter.

The Office Action takes the position that Clark discloses a first and second seal in members 18 and 19. The Applicants recognize that these two members do appear to contact one another when the door is in the closed position. However, neither are the claimed first seal or second seal.

The claimed first seal has a first sealing surface that faces the first door panel. As exemplarily described on page 7 of the present application, “facing the panel” occurs “when a line normal to [the sealing surface] projects through the plane along which the panel sweeps, such as plane 15 or 17.” Page 7, lines 6-8. Clearly, the contacting surfaces of members 18 and 19 do not produce line normals that project through the plane along which members C and D move. Clark simply does not teach the claimed first seal.

Furthermore, Clark does not teach the claimed second seal of claim 15. As the Office Action concedes, contact between members 18 and 19 is compressed contact. There is no second seal having a sliding relationship with a first seal, however. As Clark does not teach the claimed subject matter, it cannot anticipate claim 15. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Turning to claims 28 and 29, the Office Action rejects these claims as being anticipated by Saucier. As with that of claims 1, 2 and 4-11, however, the rejection is improper.

Claim 28 recites a door having a second corner seal in sliding relationship with a first corner seal and having a second sealing surface that creates "an L-shaped pattern of contact with the first sealing surface when the first door panel is in the doorway blocking position." The Office Action takes the position that Saucier teaches a plurality of panels situated such that as one panel is moved linearly a rear portion sealingly engages a front portion thereby closing an opening. The Office Action fails to recognize the recitation that the second sealing surface "creates an L-shaped pattern of contact with the first sealing surface when the first door panel is in the doorway blocking position," as recited in claims 28 and 29. The Office Action points to no such structure in Saucier as teaching this claimed subject matter, and none exists. The rejection of claims 28-29 is improper. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The applicants respectfully assert that, not only are these rejections improper, the pending claims, in fact, read over the prior art and are in condition for allowance. Favorable treatment thereof is respectfully requested. If the examiner would like to discuss this case, please feel free to contact the below signed representative.

Dated: November 25, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul B. Stephens

Registration No.: 47,970

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300 Sears Tower

Chicago, IL 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorneys for Applicant